



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/598,060	06/20/2000	Bernhard Kraus	1826-018	5495

7590 07/19/2002

Hopgood Calimafde Kalil & Judlowe
60 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10165

EXAMINER

GUADALUPE, YARITZA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2859

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/598,060

Applicant(s)

KRAUS ET AL

Examiner

Yaritza Guadalupe

Art Unit

2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-12 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the invention of Group I, claims 1- 9 and 13 – 20 in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that 1) There are no examples of any other method, nor arguments for its substitution; and 2) there is no showing of a serious burden. This is not found persuasive because De Frank et al. clearly reads on the apparatus claimed and however, does not need the particular formula and method claimed. Therefore, de Frank et al. is an example of Applicant's claimed invention and meets the limitations of claims 1 and 2 and does not need the method and formula claimed.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Accordingly, claims 10 – 12 and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 8.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 5 refers to an infrared thermometer including a second switch. The mention of a second switch, as stated in claim 5, implies that a first switch has been previously claimed, however, the first switch has been claimed in claim 4 and the dependency of claim 5 corresponds to claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 1, 2, 4 – 9, 14 – 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by DeFrank et al. (US 5,066,142).

DeFrank et al. discloses a radiation thermometer comprising an infrared sensor (See Column 3, lines 18 – 19) and a probe tip / probe head (16, 34) including a radiation inlet opening (22) enabling infrared radiation to travel from a measurement site to the sensor. DeFrank et al. discloses a probe tip / probe head that is considered to be demountably attachable to the thermometer since DeFrank et al. clearly discloses removing the probe tip / probe head (See Figure 4). DeFrank et al. discloses an opening for infrared radiation, which is closed by a window (22) transparent to infrared radiation. DeFrank et al. also discloses a switch (44) actuatable when the probe head / probe cover is installed and that the temperature indication / calculation from the measurements is influenced by the actuation of the switch (See Column 5, lines 41 – 55).

6. Claims 1 – 3, 6, 9, 13, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Pompei (US 6,047,205).

Pompei discloses a radiation detector probe comprising an infrared sensor (28) and a probe tip / head (18) including a radiation inlet opening (31) enabling infrared radiation to travel from a measurement site to the sensor. Pompei discloses a probe tip / head that in a broad sense is considered to be demountably attachable to the thermometer since it can be removed by any means if so desired by the user. Pompei discloses the probe tip / head being pivotal in at least one spatial plane (See Figure 2 and Column 5, lines 14 – 17). Pompei discloses an opening for infrared radiation which is closed by a window (35) transparent to infrared radiation. Pompei discloses the geometrical shape of the probe head being selected so that the measurement site is shielded from the environment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 7, 8, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeFrank et al. (US 5,066,142)) in view of Pompei et al. (US 5,893,833) and further in view of European Patent (411,121 A1) [Hereinafter EP].

DeFrank et al. discloses a radiation thermometer as stated in paragraph 5 above.

DeFrank et al. does not disclose the funnel-shaped configuration as stated in claims 7 – 8 and 18 – 19.

With respect to claims 7 – 8 and 18 – 19 : DeFrank et al. discloses a probe tip / probe head comprising a funnel – shaped configuration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to change the shape of the probe tip / probe head disclosed by DeFrank et al. with a funnel – shaped tip / head as taught by Pompei et al. ('833) in order to enhance the measurements by increasing the area of heat transfer and since the use of a funnel – shape on the probe tip / head is only considered to be an obvious modification of the shape or configuration of the probe tip / head shape disclosed by DeFrank et al. as the courts have held that a change in shape or configuration, without any criticality, is within the level of skill in the art as the particular shape claimed by Applicant is nothing more than one of numerous shapes that a person having ordinary skill in the art will find obvious to provide using routine experimentation based on its suitability for the intended use of the invention. See *In re Dailey*, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976).

However, EP discloses a thermometer having a tip / head (12) having a size and shape conforming to the cavity, i.e., ear, or oral cavity, (See Column 6, lines 36 – 39). In a broad sense, EP implicitly teaches the option of providing a plurality of configurations, i.e., geometrical shape and funnel – shaped, for the probe tip / head in order to fit the probe to the measurement site. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a probe tip / head having a geometrical shape selected to fit the measurement site as taught by EP in the radiation probe disclosed by Pompei and Pompei et al. ('833) in order to enhance the device by providing a painless alternate mechanism that fit to every patient kids and adults.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 9 and 13 - 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2859

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yaritza Guadalupe whose telephone number is (703)305 -5676.

The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego F.F. Gutierrez can be reached on (703) 308-3875. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.



Y. Guadalupe
July 16, 2002

DIEGO F.F. GUTIERREZ
SUPERVISOR PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800